DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 632 CS 506 422

AUTHOR Twohy, Kevin M.
TITLE Resolved: That "Should" Should Appear in CEDA Debate Resolutions.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 6p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (74th, New Orleans, LA, November 3-6, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Debate; Higher Education; *Judges; Persuasive Discourse; *Public Speaking; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Cross Examination Debate Association; Debate Tournaments; *National Debate Tournament

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that there is a need to take a negative position on "Resolved: that 'should' should appear in Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) debate resolutions." The paper also asserts that it needs to be clear that value debate is not a policy debate. The first contention offered to defend this position is that value propositions must be separated from policy propositions. The second contention is that Collegiate Debate is in a crisis. A pre-policy counterplan is proposed that suggests (1) a new organization for college debate called the Intercollegiate Debate Education Association (IDEA); (2) the students will debate one policy proposition with value-laden implications per school year; (3) a new speaking format; and (4) several changes in procedures and regulations. The paper concludes that the adoption of the proposal will mean more fun in academic debate; allow all students to compete in the same division; and provide for a much better focus on and presentation of the issues. (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299632

Resolved: that "should" should appear in CEDA debate resolutions

First Negative Position
presented by Kevin M. Twohy
Carroll College
Second Negative will be
presented by Steven R. Brydon,
Cal-State Chico

Speech Communication Association Convention
November 4, 1988
New Orleans, LA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kevin Twohy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS506422

> I tend to operate from what I call the "policy - making" paradigm. That is, I tend to view CEDA topics as a reasonable, rational policy - maker would. Consequently, I feel that policy implications stemming from a given value must be addressed to a point. Also this paradigm indicates a strong aversion to "strange, far out" argumentation. In sum, my paradigm is a very "real world" one.

This quotation from Brian Simmons, a professor at Pepperdine University, from the 1988 CEDA National Tournament judging philosophy booklet shows the reason why we need to take a negative position on Resolved: That "should" should appear in CEDA debate resolutions.It needs to be clear that value debate is not a policy debate. It may be a "real world" debate, but not a policy paradigm.

To defend our position, Steven and I would like to offer our negative case - which will include two contentions and a pre-policy plan.

Contention Number One: Value propositions must be separated from policy propositions. Let me repeat that for those of you intoxicated with hurricanes from Pat O'Brien's. Value propositions must be separated from policy propositions.

Subpoint A: Policy models in Value debate are counter productive. Michael Bartanen, in a 1983 CEDA yearbook, in an article entitled "The Role of Values in Policy Controversies" stated:

Using a pre-policy model for value debates make these debates both unrealistic and counter-productive. Treating a value proposition like a policy proposition encourages the affirmative to narrowly draw their case so as to negate the likelihood that the negative will find workability flaws in their analysis.

Subpoint B: The roots of CEDA are centered on value debate not policy debate. Jack Howe stated in the report of the executive secretary of CEDA in 1982 that:

> A genuine concern is expressed as to the future direction of CEDA debate. He reminded CEDA coaches of the roots of the activity, stressing the goals of "communicative delivery, a balance among evidence, argument, and analysis, audience appeals and appropriate demands on students' time and energy."
>
> To those students who now debate CEDA with no regard for a communicative delivery and who believe that the key to success in CEDA is the amassing of hoards of evidence to the disparagement of argumentation and analysis and who persist in distorting our debate topics so as to make a mockery of them, I suggest that there is an alternative form of debate available: it is called NDT. Since you have not left it in spirit, then why don't you rejoin it in actuality?

Although in 1988, CEDA has moved closer to NDT in use of evidence, argument, analysis, and delivery. It may be time to reflect on the roots of CEDA, and the reason for the break from NDT. Which leads to the second contention: Collegiate Debate is in a crisis. For those of you suffering from a coffee and chicory overdose let me repeat: Collegiate debate is in a crisis.

Subpoint A: NDT is dying. Robert Rowland, in the Spring 1988 JAFA stated:

> Academic policy debate is in a state of crisis. By virtually any measure we are experiencing a significant decline in participation in NDT debate. Subscription rates in all districts are down significantly. Tournaments that once boasted a hundred plus teams now struggle to attract fifty entrants. Regional tournaments often attract so few teams that no sort of power pairing scheme is permitted. The experimental expansion of the NDT in 1987 was, at least in the short run, a failure. Only fourteen teams applied for the ten available second round at-large bids.
>
> In short, at both the regional and national levels, NDT debate is very sick, perhaps dying.

Subpoint B: Argumentation practices in CEDA and NDT are absurd. Rowland continues:

> Too many outside observers the practices that are common in NDT debate (and which are becoming far more common in CEDA) seem absurd. Moreover, the practices effectively discourage all but the most committed coaches and debaters from participation.

Subpoint C: The feud between NDT and CEDA is useless. Al Louden and Curtis Austin argued in the CEDA yearbook way back in 1983 that:

> The feud which separates "CEDA people" from "NDT people" is as useless and artificial as the separation of argument and delivery. An advocate should be trained in both the study of argument and the skills necessary for persuasive delivery. It is not the purpose of the authors to deny the differences in focus of CEDA and NDT debate, it is rather to celebrate it. We are concerned that forensic coaches often fail to appreciate the role performed by each of the debate formats and the value of each. This lack of understanding is harmful for the activity in general and for the student if particular.
>
> One symptom of this ethnocentric attitude is the espousal of the position that CEDA, by maintaining the "true" values of debate, will save the activity from itself. In other words, CEDA represents what is good in debate and NDT represents what is leading to debate's demise.

Subpoint D: Should is filled with pernicious connotations. Bud Zeuschner in an article entitled "We ought to be afraid of "should" but should we be afraid of "ought," printed in the CEDA 1983 yearbook stated:

> So how do we get out of the trivia often called for with "is" and avoid the pernicious connotations of "should?" As I am a victim of my training, I have a plan. We could simply appropriate the word "ought" as a CEDA convention.
>
> "Ought" is helpful, although often found to be synonymous with "should," it does not have that connotation or convention in the world of debate. Even better, in the world of dictionary, "ought" is filled with value overtones.

Because Steven and I believe that "ought" or "should" should not be used in a CEDA debate resolution, and because when should has been on the CEDA ballot as a topic choice it was voted down by the CEDA coaches, we propose the following new pre-policy counter plan to be enacted by any and all means necessary:

Plank 1. A new organization for college debate should be established. It will be called the Intercollegiate Debate Education Association (IDEA).

Plank 2. This new debate organization (IDEA) will have the following functions:

A. The students will debate one policy proposition with value-laden implications per school year.

B. Three students will debate on each side of the resolution. The debate sides will be called pro and con-speaking for or against the resolution. The teams will switch sides each round, and there will be an appropriate number of elimination rounds after the preliminary rounds.

C. The speaking format will be as follows.

1AC - 6 minutes	Present an affirmative case
1NC - 6 minutes	Present a negative case
2AC - 4 minutes	Clarify aff. position \ Rebut. negative case
2NC - 4 minutes	Clarify neg. position \ Rebut. affirmative case

3NC will CX both Affirmative speakers - 4 minutes
3AC will CX both Negative speakers - 4 minutes
10 minute break - either team can meet with coaches, students or audience members
3NC will present a 6 minute rebuttal
3AC will present a 6 minute rebuttal
-Preparation time - five minutes per side
Total time for the debate is one hour.

Plank 3. Procedures and Regulations. Membership will be open to any college or University at the 2-year or 4-year level. Membership fees will be $10.00 per year. Point standings will be established in the 3rd year of competition. A national tournament will be implemented and self-supporting. The national tournament will be open to any team in America. A student may enter the national tournament four times, but may debate at any other tournaments throughout their undergraduate career. A constitution will be established by a national steering committee.

The following advantage will result from the adoption of this proposal.

Advantage: There will be more fun in academic debate. This format allows all students to compete in the same division. A novice speaker could be a first speaker and a more advanced student of argument could be the third speaker. Then each student could learn and participate within their own level, and still have the benefit of competing against the very best debaters in the nation. This format will provide for a much better focus and presentation on the issues. Coaches and judges could set educational parameters during the 10-minute issue focus period. The debate is within a 1-hour time period. So tournaments can be shorter. The organizational structure will have all the advantages of CEDA and NDT combined. Vote for progress and new peace - vote for an IDEA - vote negative.